DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 457 32 EA 003 685

TITLE Alabama Annual Evaluation Report: Title I Programs, Fiscal Year 1970. Title I of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

INSTITUTION Alabama State Dept. of Education, Montgomery.

PUB DATE 70

NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS Alabama, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Alabama State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. A related document is ED 037 514. (Page 11 may reproduce poorly.) (EA)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053457

STATE OF ALABAMA

Governor . . . . . Albert P. Brewer

State Superintendent of Education . . . . . Ernest Stone

State Board of Education

Dr. James D. Nettles	W. M. Beck, Sr.
Ed Dannelly	Victor Poole
Mrs. Carl Strang	W. C. Davis
Fred L. Merrill	Cecil Word
Rev. Harold C. Martin	

Division of Administration and Finance

W. H. Kimbrough, Director
J. H. Boockholdt, Assistant Director

Title I Staff

W. E. Mellown, Jr.	Coordinator
E. A. Spear	Assistant Coordinator
C. M. Youngblood	Consultant
G. W. Hause	Consultant
J. L. Kelley	Consultant
Ann Harmon	Evaluation Consultant

Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1970

This report is based on the list of questions supplied by the U. S. Office of Education.

STATE TITLE I, ESEA EVALUATION

QUESTIONS FOR FY 1970

	FY 70
I. Provide the following basic State statistics:	
A. Total number of operating LEA's in the state	121
B. Number of LEA's participating in Title I	119
1. During regular school term	119
2. During summer term only	None
3. During both regular and summer	119
C. Number of Title I programs	119
D. Number of Title I participants	777,634
1. Public schools	767,768
2. Private	5,073
3. Not enrolled (Library Services, Recreational, Dropout Programs)	4,793
E. Number of institutions participating	5
Number of children in institutions	2,974
F. Number of migrant programs	7
Number of migrant participants	1,073

II. During FY 1970, indicate the number of SEA Title I staff visits to LEA's participating in Title I. By objective of visit (planning, program development, program operation, evaluation, etc.), specify the purposes of these visits and their effect on the development, operation, and evaluation of local projects. Indicate proportion of visits, by type.

Each of the 119 LEA's was visited during the regular term at least once by SEA Title I staff members for the purpose of making administrative reviews or reviewing special programs. These reviews were to check the program while in operation to see if the LEA's were doing what they had written into their applications. Follow-up letters were written

reporting the findings, pointing out any variations being made and making suggestions.

The SEA does not take part in the actual program planning and development except when asked. Training in writing project proposals was given at area conferences and at a three-day state-wide summer conference.

A field accountant was employed in October to aide LEA's with accounting problems. His service has been very helpful to the LEA's. He did special accounting reviews in 24 LEA's before the year was over. The reviews were designed to point out any procedures which were not being done in compliance with federal and state regulations. He assists new bookkeepers and accountants in setting up correct systems of accounting.

Arrangements were made for twenty principals and supervisors to visit the summer programs. These people received one day of orientation and a special outline to follow in reviewing and reporting. Each of the five Title I consultants worked with four of the reviewers who were assigned to particular LEA's. This proved to be very good for public relations and dissemination.

The LEA coordinators made many visits to the SEA office. They felt free to call or come in any time they had questions or needed help.

Records were kept by the SEA Title I staff members, including the accountant and the statistician. The combined numbers are large because four people may have seen the same person. A LEA coordinator usually saw the consultant assigned to his system, the evaluation consultant, the bookkeeper, statistician, etc. on one trip. Each staff member used the following form on which totals of sheets for 6 staff members are combined.

TITLE I ESEA

INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF MEMBERS IN CONFERENCES AND FIELD SERVICES FY 70

1. Office conferences with educators	988
Office conferences with others	402
Telephone conferences with LEA's	2,306
2. Participation in Educational Conferences	
Local	86
Statewide	12
Regional	60
National	36
Other educational conferences attended	6
Regular staff meetings	64
Planning meetings for conferences	20
3. Field Services	
Days spent in the field	416
Visits to schools	306
Meetings with administrators	169
Meetings with school staff groups	121
Meetings with lay groups	46
Meetings with college or university groups	64

III. Describe any changes your agency has made in the last three years in its procedures and the effect of such changes to:
A. improve the quality of Title I projects
B. insure proper participation of nonpublic school children
C. modify local projects in the light of State and local evaluation

A. The quality of Title I projects improved as the LEA staff members became more capable of planning and administering the programs. The greatest difficulty has been in helping the LEA's adjust programs at the last minute due to the closing of schools by court orders. The amount spent, on equipment was reduced from 3.7 percent of the total allocation in 1969 to 1.1 percent in 1970, while the amount spent on personnel increased. More questions were asked about whether proposed programs, such as guidance and driver education, were supplanting rather than supplementing or were also being funded through another source. LEA's were urged to concentrate activities and services i elementary areas as much as possible on a limited number of participants. They were also urged to assess needs and be more specific in selecting participants.

B. The SDE felt no need to modify its criteria for program approval providing for children enrolled in non-public schools. Fifty-one non-public schools in 23 LEA's had 5,073 participants in Title I programs. These were mainly parochial schools which are discussed in Part V. Other non-public schools were organized to take the children out of integrated schools. They were not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act and had no wish for any federal aid.

The coordinator of governmental programs named by the superintendent of the Catholic schools attended the Title I workshops and met with public school coordinators to help plan programs. He furnished information needed for determining eligibility of the parochial schools and provided

lists of needs of the schools. He and the LEA staff members enjoy a good relationship. Children from non-public schools were urged to take part in the summer programs.

C. The LEA project planning was affected by evaluation requirements. The LEA's were required to write specific measurable objectives and plans for evaluating each objective. This caused them to cut down on the number of projects to be implemented. The LEA's which did not have trained personnel for grading and interpreting tests wrote into their budgets a sum for evaluation. The SEA evaluation consultant assisted in 10 LEA workshops. She shared copies of checklists and other evaluation materials with the LEA's at state-wide meetings. A format for the 1970 annual evaluation report was supplied to the LEA's in June of 1969. Thus, the LEA's knew what was required for evaluation before the 1970 applicationswere written. Individual and/or small group conferences on evaluation methods were held and evaluation was discussed at a state-wide meeting.

IV. Effect upon Education Achievement

A. What effect, if any, has Title I had upon the educational achievement of educationally deprived children including those children enrolled in non-public schools in your State? On the basis of objective State-wide evidence - not testimonials or examples but hard data -- describe the impact on reading achievement levels of educationally deprived pupils, including non-public school pupils. With standardized achievement test results, compare the achievement of participants in Title I projects to that of all pupils of the same grade level in the State using current national and statewide norms and specify the norms used. All evidence should be based on the educational performance of a significant number of Title I participants in your State. Indicate the number of Title I participants for which data are presented.

B. What are common characteristics of those Title I projects in your State that are most effective in improving educational achievement?

C. What evidence, if any, have you found in your State that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to cost?

A. Objective data

Test results from standardized tests(California Achievement) are on pages 31-34 . These results were given because there were more of them. The LEA's chose the reading programs they wished to use and the tests they used. Many used tests that came with the reading materials. Therefore, a variety of tests were used. The teachers wrote many glowing reports of progress and human interest stories. Those reports are attached to the special reports requested by the U.S.O.E. They were enthusiastic and pleased with the progress made even though standardized test results do not show much improvement. The lack of progress shown was often due to the facts that many of the pupils had no test experience and had not been trained to follow directions, some of the teachers had no experience in administering standardized tests, and the tests were not designed for deprived children. With the pupils being moved, it was almost impossible to do pre and post testing on the same children. It was impossible to stabilize groups long enough to conduct experiments when new court orders were issued regularly.

Test results are also included in many of the special reports mentioned previously.

B. The most effective programs were in intensive reading programs which were aided through teacher-training; use of aides; more and better supplies and equipment; the supplying of food and health services; and the cultural enrichment programs. The effects were cumulative rather than separable.

C. Earlier effectiveness was directly related to cost due to the need for supplies, equipment and facilities. The need for those things has leveled off, but the need for trained personnel, or the training of personnel has increased. Therefore, the effectiveness of the programs was still related to cost. Sixty LEA's reported that they were unable to employ trained reading teachers. Others were unable to employ remedial math teachers, elementary counselors, school nurses, etc. Teachers are not willing to attend colleges in the summer when the funding of the Title I program is so uncertain.

V. What effect, if any, has the Title I program had on the administrative structure and educational practices of your State Education Agency, Local Education Agencies, and non-public schools?

Title I has had a definite effect on the SEA, LEA's and non-public schools in areas not covered in Part III above. The SEA, through necessity, became more involved than ever before in working with the local systems. The SEA was more aware of the problems of assessing needs and in staffing and administering programs which beset the LEA's. Through visiting and helping, workshops and conferences, the SEA became more conscious of the needs and problems and of the part it must play.

The LEA's were more conscious of the need for long-range planning. There was more sharing of experiences and problems as mutual involvement grew. Practices used in special Title I programs have spilled over into the regular program. The involvement of parents has also grown. Reports of parent and community involvement are attached.

The SEA and LEA's had more communication with the nonpublic schools which saw an advantage in becoming a part of the total school program.

The school program in Alabama has been upgraded by having the use of Title I funds to meet needs in instruction, services, and training, and by having specific procedures to follow in planning and administering programs.

VI. Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged

A. If State funds have been used to augment Title I programs, describe the number of projects, objectives of the programs, rationale for increased funding with State money, and the amount and proportion of total program funds provided by the State for the 1969-70 school year. Indicate the number of projects, number of participants, objectives of the programs, and the level of funding for the 1969-70 school year. Provide data separately for all compensatory education programs, if any, supported entirely by State funds which were operated specifically for the educationally deprived.

The funds appropriated by the State for the programs described below are supplementary to other funds which may be federal or local.

1. Free Textbooks - To guarantee that all children had access to needed books the state appropriated $1,756,452 for textbooks.
2. Exceptional Children - The State paid for 609 classroom teachers and for transportation to centers. The classes were for mentally retarded, physically handicapped, speech disorders, emotionally disturbed, aphasoid, hard-of-hearing, home bound, socially maladjusted, and trainable. In addition to paying the teachers as regular teacher units and supplying transportation for those able to ride a regular school bus, appropriations were as listed on the following pages.

These classes were held within the buildings where other classes were held, when feasible. Teachers were required to hold a major in special education as specified by the State Department of Education (Certification). Each child had a complete physical and mental evaluation. The teacher-pupil ratio was held very low, and teaching was on an individual basis.

3. Three Industrial Schools - Appropriation $1,217,266 for delinquent and neglected children. These schools provided academic instruction and industrial training. Living quarters, food, and clothing were provided. Residents worked on projects which trained the students for future jobs and brought some income to the school. Psychologists and counselors worked with the residents for a change in attitude and upgrading of self-image. Teaching techniques were those needed as indicated by test results. Teaching was individualized as much as possible.

4. Partlow State School - For retarded children. The State appropriation was $225,523. This school is adjacent to the campus of a State mental institution for adults which receives a fairly large appropriation. Many of the services available in the mental institution were also available to Partlow through the use of state-grown food supply, use of medical doctors, psychologists, chaplains, art and craft teachers, and facilities for these activities. Many private organizations make regular contributions to the school.

Techniques used were those used for special classes for mentally retarded children. The children live there the year round, so much training is given in group living. The atmosphere is excellent, but the facilities are very overcrowded. The pupils appear very happy. They look forward to training in the crafts shop, singing in the chapel, picnics, etc. Student teachers from the nearby University of Alabama who are majoring in guidance

and counseling, special education, speech therapy, music, art, etc. spend many hours with the children.

5. Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind received a State appropriation of $1,609,281. A State-owned farm supplements the income by supplying fresh vegetable, poultry, pork, and beef for the students, all of which live on the campus. There is also a meat processing plant. This institution also gains some income from the sale of art and craft objects made by the students and sold by members of service clubs and religious and professional groups. These groups also make contributions to the school as part of their service projects.

Techniques used are those which are most suited to the particular handicap.

State Department of Education
Division of Administration and Finance

ALABAMA SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1968-69, 1969-70, AND 1970-71

	1968-69 Absolute and Conditional Appropriations		1969-70 Absolute Appropriation		1969-70 Conditional Appropriation		1970-71 Absolute Appropriation		1970-71 Conditional Appropriation	
Alabama A. & M. University	$ 2,008,113.00 1/		$ 2,339,452.00		$ -- 1/		$ 2,417,325.00		$ 137,357.00	
Alabama State University	2,029,185.00		2,364,000.00		--		2,442,690.00		138,798.00 1/	
Auburn University - Main Campus	15,600,750.00		18,161,077.00		500,000.00 *		18,756,879.00		1,565,827.00	
Auburn University at Montgomery	200,000.00 2/		1,000,000.00		--		1,135,480.00		64,520.00	
Total Auburn University	$ 15,800,750.00 3/		$ 19,161,077.00		$ 500,000.00 *		$ 19,892,359.00		$ 1,630,347.00	
Florence State University	95,500.00 4/		1,970,966.00		121,200.00		2,039,071.00		223,273.00	
Jacksonville State University	95,500.00 4/		3,123,569.00		192,100.00		3,227,734.00		357,631.00	
Jacksonville State University Nursing School	250,000.00 1/		250,000.00		--		250,000.00		--	
Total Jacksonville State University	$ 345,500.00		$ 3,373,569.00		$ 192,100.00		$ 3,477,734.00		$ 357,631.00	
Livingston State University	338,500.00 4/		1,071,934.00		65,900.00 1/		1,111,474.00		118,913.00	
Troy State University	88,500.00 4/		1,964,051.00		120,800.00		2,031,461.00		222,971.00	
Troy State University School of Nursing	15,000.00*		12,000.00 5/		200,000.00 **		18,000.00 5/		200,000.00	
Total Troy State University	$ 103,500.00		$ 1,976,051.00		$ 320,800.00		$ 2,049,461.00		$ 422,971.00	
Teacher Training Equalization Fund	6,181,802.00		--		--		--		--	
University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa	10,786,831.00		12,616,607.00 6/		781,000.00		13,056,041.00 6/		1,599,694.00	
University of Alabama at Huntsville	2,666,123.00		2,191,033.00		--		2,242,202.00		127,406.00	
University of Alabama at Birmingham	1,313,500.00		2,430,227.00		--		2,432,773.00		138,235.00	
University of Alabama Medical Center	5,878,842.00		7,236,990.00 7/		525,000.00 *		7,560,866.00 7/		428,838.00	
Total University of Alabama	$ 20,645,296.00 8/		$ 24,474,857.00		$ 1,306,000.00		$ 25,291,882.00		$ 2,294,173.00	
University of Montevallo (Alabama College)	1,567,006.00		1,825,562.00		200,000.00		1,886,329.00		157,185.00	
University of South Alabama	3,133,155.00		3,650,125.00		300,000.00		3,771,625.00		514,311.00	
Adult Basic Education (Removal of Illiteracy)	100,000.00		116,500.00		--		120,378.00		6,840.00	
Civil Defense Survival Plan	9,037.50		10,528.00		--		10,879.00		618.00	
Civilian Rehabilitation	1,335,434.00 9/		1,987,726.00		--		2,010,032.00		113,645.00	
Coordination of In-School T.V. Program	23,397.00		50,000.00		--		49,677.00		2,823.00	
Free Textbooks	2,078,500.00 10/		1,756,452.00		--		1,744,508.00		127,537.00	
Minimum Program	172,690,214.00		201,230,264.00		--		207,899,362.00		11,813,221.00	
Minimum Program - Exceptional Children	--		300,000.00 11/		--		300,000.00 11/		--	
Minimum Program - Trainable Exceptional Children	318,690.00		371,274.00		--		383,632.00		21,799.00	
National Defense Education	127,250.00		148,246.00		--		153,181.00		8,704.00	
Physical Restoration of Crippled Children	1,092,361.00		1,372,600.00		--		1,409,584.00		80,095.00	
Plans and Surveys	29,605.00		34,490.00		--		35,638.00		2,025.00	
State Department of Education	653,257.20		761,044.00		--		786,377.00		44,683.00	
State Tenure Commission	2,000.00		2,000.00		--		2,000.00		--	
Vocational Education	8,383,171.00		10,766,394.00		--		11,037,719.00		627,183.00	
Alabama Boys Industrial School	442,389.46		515,384.00		--		532,539.00		30,260.00	
Alabama Education Study Commission	32,972.83		155,000.00 12/		--		155,000.00 12/		--	
Alabama Education T. V. Commission	830,696.88 13/		1,052,250.00		--		1,068,919.00		61,738.00	
Alabama Industrial School - Mt. Meigs	334,686.28		389,909.00		--		402,888.00		22,893.00	
Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind	1,596,137.00 1/		1,609,281.00		--		1,666,376.00		90,959.00	
Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind - Trade School	100,000.00		372,556.00		--		384,956.00		21,874.00	
Ala. Scholarships for Dependents of Blind Parents	5,000.00		5,250.00		--		5,250.00		--	
Alabama State Hospitals for Schools	25,000.00		29,125.00		--		27,559.00		1,566.00	
American Legion Auxiliary	1,600.00		3,000.00		--		3,000.00		--	
Anniston Memorial Hospital - Nurses Training	40,000.00		--		--		--		--	
Capital Outlay:										
Alabama A. & M. University	540,000.00		--		750,000.00		--		--	
Alabama State University	--		--		--		--		750,000.00	
Ala. Trade Sch. & Junior College Authority	35,000.00*		1,000,000.00		2,000,000.00		--		3,000,000.00	
All School Boards of Education	--		--		12,000,000.00 14/		--		--	
Elba City Board of Education	--		--		160,000.00		--		--	
Etowah County Board of Education (Altoona)	--		--		400,000.00		--		--	
Fayette County Board of Education (Fayette)	--		--		400,000.00		--		--	
Franklin County Board of Education (Union)	--		--		145,000.00		--		--	
Geneva County Board of Education (Hartford)	--		--		150,000.00		--		--	
Institute for Deaf and Blind	120,330.00 15/		--		--		--		--	
Jacksonville State Univ. Nursing School	200,000.00 16/		--		--		--		--	
Livingston State University Hospital	--		--		250,000.00 17/		--		--	
Marshall County - Kate Duncan Smith DAR School	--		--		150,000.00 18/		--		--	
Morgan County Board of Education (Florette)	--		--		--		--		200,000.00	
Northwest Alabama Junior College (for lake)	--		25,000.00 19/		--		--		--	
Wilcox County Board of Education (Camden)	--		--		180,000.00		--		180,000.00	
Winston County Board of Education (Lynn High Sch.)	--		--		100,000.00 20/*		--		--	
Commission on Higher Education	--		90,000.00 21/		--		90,000.00 21/		--	
Debt Service (Estimated)	1,258,875.78		1,276,013.75		--		1,273,120.00		--	
Dental Scholarships	83,000.00		83,000.00		--		83,000.00		--	
Driver Education	--		--		300,000.00 *		--		300,000.00	
Elementary Teachers Scholarship Fund	25,000.00		25,000.00		--		25,000.00		--	
Employees Insurance (Estimated)	14,898.98		50,000.00		--		50,000.00		--	
J. F. Ingram State Voc. Tech. Sch. - Draper Prison	126,250.00		147,081.00		--		151,976.00		8,636.00	
Junior College Equalization Account	6,747,403.00		9,360,724.00		--		9,541,732.00		542,179.00	
Legal Fees	--		50,000.00 22/		--		50,000.00 22/		--	
Manpower Development Training Act	100,000.00		100,000.00		--		100,000.00		--	
Marion Institute - Private	125,000.00 23/		75,000.00 24/		--		75,000.00 24/		--	
Mecical Scholarships	135,000.00		135,000.00		--		135,000.00		--	
Mobile Gen. Hosp. Medical & Nursing Education	370,000.00		370,000.00		200,000.00		370,000.00		200,000.00	
Montgomery Inst. of Neurological Development	--		--		25,000.00 25/*		--		25,000.00 25/	
Partlow State School	193,582.00		225,523.00		--		233,030.00		13,241.00	
Regional Education	--		220,000.00 26/		--		100,000.00		--	
Social Security (Estimated)	13,021,514.72		13,643,000.00		--		14,604,165.00		829,835.00	
Southern Ind. Inst. (Lyman Ward) - Private	42,617.00		42,617.00 27/		--		42,617.00 27/		--	
State Training School for Girls	246,328.60		311,973.00		--		321,526.00		16,849.00	
Sylacauga Nurses Training School	40,000.00		40,000.00		--		40,000.00		--	
Teachers Retirement System (Estimated)	19,751,237.00		25,426,500.00 28/		--		26,046,448.00 28/		1,386,052.00	
Teachers Special Pension Fund	--		1,453,500.00		--		1,091,480.00		62,020.00	
Trade School Equalization Account	6,910,325.00		9,050,529.00		--		9,264,739.00		526,439.00	
Tuskegee Institute - Private	470,000.00		470,000.00 29/		--		470,000.00 29/		--	
Veterans Education Benefits (Estimated)	425,551.83		400,000.00		--		400,000.00		--	
Walker County Junior College - Private	94,460.00		75,000.00 30/		--		75,000.00 30/		--	
Total	$293,576,080.06	$186,842,916.70 63.64%	$349,392,325.75	$218,907,518.00 62.65%	$20,216,000.00	$225,942,967.00 62.90%	$359,203,237.00	$12,849,173.00 47.39%	$27,113,673.00	

Appropriations for education for the fiscal years 1969-70 and 1970-71, Act No. 91, Special Session, 1969

* Conditional appropriation released

SPECIAL EDUCATION, 1969-70

$ 371,274.00	Total Trainable Cost
151,729.23	Total Act No. 786 Program Cost
4,494,771.44	Total Educable Cost
$ 5,017,774.67	Grand Total, 1969-70

$ 2,881.00	Act No. 786, Transportation
34,437.00	Educable Transportation
$ 37,318.00	Total Transportation

Educable

Type	No. of Pupils	No. of Classes	Percentage	Total Cost	Cost per Pupil
				($29,515.95)	
MR	5,724	522	85.71	$3,822,952.65	$673.04
				($4,921.05)	
PH	520	21	3.45	153,881.54	305.39
ST & H	3,201	55	9.03	402,768.20	125.83
ED	32	3	.49	21,855.64	682.99
SM	20	2	.33	14,719.10	735.96
LD	85	6	.99	44,157.31	519.50
Total	9,582	609	100.00	$4,460,334.44	x x x x
			Transportation	34,437.00	
				$4,494,771.44	$485.60 per Educable Pupi

Trainable

$\frac{\$371.274}{695} = \$534.21$ per pupil

Act No. 786

$\frac{\$151,729.23}{535} = \$283.61$ per pupil (1/2 year)

Grand Total

$\frac{\$5,017,774.67}{9,582 + 695 + 535} = \frac{\$5,017,774.67}{10,812} = \$464.09$

$\frac{\$371,274 + \$151,729.23 + \$3,822,952.65 + \$29,515.95}{695 + 535 + 5,724} = \$629.20$ per MR pupil

1969-70 Final Calculation - Educable Exceptional Education

Rank of Certification	Teacher Units	Salary Allotment	Allocation
I	161.50	$ 7,100	$1,146,650.00
II	430.69	6,121	2,636,253.49
III	21.00	4,944	103,824.00
IV	13.00	4,169	54,197.00
V	11.00	3,588	39,468.00
Total	637.19	xxxxx	$3,980,392.49

Principals' Supplement (571.00 teacher Units X $72)	$41,112.00
Total Salaries	$4,021,504.49
Transportation	34,437.00
Capital Outlay (571.00 teacher units X $68.1789363)	38,930.17
Other Current Expense (571.00 teacher units X $700.3498774)	399,899.78
Total	$4,494,771.44

Homebound, Hospital and Clinic Units*:

	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV	Rank V	Total
Counties	6.50	20.25	.00	1.00	.00	27.75
Cities	12.00	26.44	.00	.00	.00	38.44
Total	18.50	46.69	.00	1.00	.00	66.19

---

* Principals' Supplement, Capital Outlay, and Other Current Expense not allowed for 66.19 Homebound, Hospital, and Clinic units.

CALCULATION OF TRAINABLE PROGRAM, 1969-70

A. Funds Available

Administrative Expenses	$ 32,899.00
Other Expenses	5,645.00
Distribution to Local Boards	328,130.00
Equipment	4,600.00
Total	$371,274.00

B. Calculation of Teachers' Salaries

Rank of Certificate	Number of Units	Salary Allotment	Total Allotment (If Paid)	Amount Paid By Systems	Full Allocation
I	11.02	$ 7,100	$ 78,230.00	$ 78,223.84	$ 76,648.95
II	35.24	6,121	215,704.00	218,269.85	212,531.97
III	2.00	4,944	9,888.00	9,585.73	9,585.73
IV	3.43	4,169	14,300.00	13,904.35	13,807.35
V	4.41	3,588	15,823.00	16,281.00	15,556.00
Total	56.10	x x x	$333,945.00	$336,264.77	$328,130.00

C. Contract-Approved Teacher Units for Trainable Classes

	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV	Rank V	Total
Counties	6.00	24.57	1.00	1.43	.00	33.00
Cities	5.02	10.67	1.00	2.00	4.41	23.10
Total	11.02	35.24	2.00	3.43	4.41	56.10

CALCULATION OF ACT 786 -- EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, 1969-70

A. Funds Available

Teachers' Salaries	$148,848.23
Transportation	2,881.00
Total	$151,729.23

B. Calculation of Teachers' Salaries

Rank of Certificate	Number of Units	Salary Allotment	Total Allotment (if Paid)	Amount Paid By Systems	Full Allocation
I	3.97	$7,100	$ 28,199.00	$ 27,137.25	$ 27,137.25
II	19.98	6,121	122,298.00	114,968.80	114,735.22
III	1.46	4,944	7,218.00	6,585.76	6,585.76
IV	.00	4,169	.00	.00	.00
V	.22	3,588	789.00	390.00	390.00
Total	25.63	x x x	$158,504.00	$149,081.81	$148,848.23

C. Contract-Approved Teacher Units for Act 786 Classes

	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV	Rank V	Total
Counties	2.56	13.58	1.00	.00	.22	17.36
Cities	1.41	6.40	.46	.00	.00	8.27
Total	3.97	19.98	1.46	.00	.22	25.63

TITLE I, E.S.E.A.

FY 1970

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

	REGULAR TERM		SUMMER TERM	
LEA	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS
Baldwin	500	$ 58,000		
Blount	20	3,300	14	$ 375
Bullock	59	1,750		
Cherokee	35	1,900	18	1,800
Chilton	15	6,304		
Choctaw	100	30,872		
Clarke	30	16,000		
Covington	25	5,868		
Escambia	30	15,000		
Fayette	14	6,100		
Hale	25	15,000	25	3,000
Lowndes	15	8,000	15	2,000
Macon	72	6,964		
Madison	150	21,000		
Mobile	1076	249,708		
Monroe	106	15,000		
Morgan	12	6,709		
Pike	15	5,000	15	800
Randolph	15	5,257		
Russell			60	5,593
Shelby	150	23,000		
Alexander City	10	7,000		
Birmingham			500	17,178

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE HANDICAPPED
(Continued)

LEA	REGULAR TERM		SUMMER TERM	
	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS
Dothan			600	$ 1,000
Elba			25	1,240
Gadsden			60	7,310
Huntsville	45	$ 18,855		
Opelika	15	5,800		
Ozark	68	33,691	45	2,300
Talladega City	15	7,000		
Tuscaloosa City	75	9,000	75	4,800
TOTAL	2,692	$582,078	1,452	$47,396

SPEECH THERAPY

	REGULAR TERM		SUMMER TERM	
LEA	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS
Baldwin	400	$9,000		
Blount	70	200		
Butler	220	8,398	100	$1,000
Chambers	75	6,500		
Chilton			80	2,586
Choctaw	280	2,643	2,021	1,421
Coffee			406	4,455
DeKalb	300	7,000		
Mobile	388	20,138		
Montgomery	269	14,000	404	5,000
Tuscaloosa Co.	75	7,652		
Bessemer	181	7,108		
Fairfield	240	11,651		
Huntsville	50	12,570		
Selma	____	____	125	1,000
TOTAL	2,548	$106,860	3,136	$15,462

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

	REGULAR TERM		SUMMER TERM	
LEA	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS
Bullock	30	$ 1,000		
Pike	15	6,000	15	$ 8,700
Dothan	95	330		
Ozark	68	500	45	500
Tuscaloosa City	75	3,235	___	_____
TOTAL	283	$11,065	60	$9,200

	REGULAR TERM		SUMMER TERM	
	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT OF FUNDS
GRAND TOTAL	5,523	$700,003	4,648	$72,058

Combined Regular and Summer Term ---$772,061.00

B. Provide descriptions of outstanding examples of the coordination of Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs. Identify the other programs and agencies involved.

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS

If funds or services from other ESEA Titles or from other local, State or Federal programs or agencies were used in cooperation with the Title I funds, check as many of the sources of supplementary assistance to this Title I project as apply.

(The 119 LEA's marked the programs as tabulated below. Details are on the following pages.)

118	ESEA Title II
39	ESEA Title III
15	ESEA Title IV
27	ESEA Title V
37	ESEA Title VI-A
14	Education Profession Development Act
73	U. S. Department of Agriculture Food Program
43	Headstart - OEO - Community Action Agency
40	Neighborhood Youth Corps - OEO - Community Action Agency
103	NDEA Title III
41	NDEA Title V-a
43	Vocational Education Act of 1963
4	George Barden Act
16	Smith Hughes Act
0	Job Corps
56	State Social and Welfare Agencies
22	Federal Social and Welfare Agencies
21	Medical Aid to Indigent Families
____	Other (Specify)

1. College Work Study Program
2. Mental Health Centers
3. Society for Crippled Children
4. Rehabilitation
5. Cooperative Extension Services
6. Adult Basic Education
7. NDEA V-B
8. Teacher Corps
9. VISTA
10. CAP (Emergency Food and Medical Services)

1. Community Action Agencies -- There are 24 CAA's in Alabama. Fourteen of these agencies serve two or more school districts. These agencies have been very helpful in locating deprived children and assessing needs through surveys. They have helped with parental involvement by acquainting them with services which are available through CAA and Title I and by offering services such as counseling, recreation, and night classes to parents. CAA has supplemented Title I by aiding in preschool services. Records from Head Start are made available to first grade pupils. In one LEA a music teacher was supplied by Title I for training Head Start children.

2. Title II has been the program most coordinated with Title I. Library books and audiovisual materials have been used by Title I participants. Librarians and aides employed under Title I maintain and distribute these materials. Special emphasis is placed on reading and related activities in Title I programs. This effort is enhanced by Title II.

3. Title III ESEA -- Twenty-eight Title III programs were in operation. Those which were most coordinated with Title I were the media centers which served several surrounding areas. Materials and services were invaluable to Title I programs. Title III teacher-training centers and workshops were used by Title I personnel. Cultural arts projects were used by Title I cultural enrichment programs.

4. Title III N.D.E.A. -- Materials bought through this program were used to great advantage by Title I participants.

5. Title IV -- No Title IV projects were operated through the State. Several LEA's had projects which were conducted through a regional manager who works out from the Atlanta office. Those LEA's used Title IV funds for extended school days, tutorial programs, hiring and training personnel, and trips for teachers to view and study innovation methods being used in other areas.

6. Title V -- ESEA -- Coordination of Title V and Title I within the SEA has effected peripheral benefits to the LEA's. Title I funds were used in conjunction with Title I funds in a study of the organization of the SEA; in providing consultative and technical assistance in academic areas and in special education; in providing leadership and consultative services to schools trying to meet accreditation standards: in collecting and storing information through the use of data processing; through providing services that assist in developing, improving, and expanding activities of the school lunch and transportation programs and of the graphic arts section; and in initiating and implementing an in-service program for all SEA personnel. All of these activities had a positive effect on the LEA's through supplying leadership and services which affected all programs being conducted by them.

Ten percent of the Title V money was distributed to local school systems on the basis of need for planning and/or implementing programs for the development, improvement, or expansion of activities at the local, county, or regional level. All systems were eligible to submit applications for the Flow Through funds.

Six LEA's applied for funds. Four other systems applied for funding to conduct area workshops for working on an incentive pay plan for teachers. The titles of the projects which follow indicate how the funds were used in programs designed to meet identified needs and that these programs were adaptable to those provided with Title I funds:

Developing Professional and Lay Leaders

Middle-School Planning

Video-Tape Media

Cooperative Research

Local Efforts Study

Inservice Training

Workshops/Incentive Pay

Area I - Decatur

Area II - Birmingham

Area III - Pike County

Area IV - Monroe County

7. Title V - A & B, N.D.E.A. -- Title V staff members have aided with Title I evaluations and other testing programs. Title V - trained counselors have been paid from Title I funds.

8. N.Y.C. -- Title I coordinators worked closely with the N.Y.C. in cooperative plans for supplying work training and night classes. In some LEA's trainees worked as library trainees, reading center assistants, and aides. One LEA had a N.Y.C. summer tutoring program.

9. S.E.L. -- Five LEA's have taken part in pilot studies administered by the Southeastern Laboratories. The experience has been good for the LEA's, and the testing program conducted by S.E.L. was helpful to Title I teachers, especially in LEA's where teachers were not well-trained in testing and analyzing test scores. The main areas of study were in communication skills and readiness.

10. Headstart -- Programs for preschool children funded by O.E.O. were held in the districts where C.A.A.'s existed. During the regular term, 17 Headstart programs were held for one half day, eleven for a full school day, and eleven for summer only. The programs are very helpful in preparing students for school, especially in the communications area. Student records are available to Title I teachers. Some of the programs were administered by the boards of education and were considered a very important part of the educational program.

11. Education Professional Deve ment Act -- Six workshops or institutes were held under e B-2 program for training teacher-aides. One hundred thirty-seven aides were trained. Title I consultants helped with coordinating the training since the teacher-aides are employed with Title I funds. The teacher-aide training programs were coordinated with local, state and federal programs through the sharing of personnel, facilities and funds.

    The teacher-training program helped relieve the need for elementary teachers in the area of remedial reading, speech

correction, etc. Sixty-six teachers trained in the B-2 program were employed with Title I funds.

12. Adult Basic Education -- Some students in this program were employed as Title I teacher or library aides.

13. State Social and Welfare Agencies -- These agencies supply information on low income children and help with clothing and other family problems. Title I supplements some of the services and often provides psychological testing.

14. Appalachian Funds -- The trade and technical schools funded by this agency provided training for Title I secondary students.

15. Vocational Education Act, George Barden Act and Smith Hughes Act -- Title I children were helped through vocational counseling and specially designed classes to meet their needs.

VII. Evaluate the success of Title I in bringing compensatory education to children enrolled in nonpublic schools. Include in your evaluation such factors as the number of projects, the quality of projects, the time of the day and/or year when projects are offered, the adaptions to meet the specific educational needs of educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools, changes in legal interpretations, and joint planning with nonpublic school officials.

The nonpublic schools in Alabama fall into two main categories: the private schools and the parochial schools.

The private schools which have been established as a protest against busing and over-crowded classrooms are not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act. The students are financially able to pay for all educational expenses. They refuse to participate in any way. The parochial schools and other nonpublic schools which were eligible to participate in Title I funds did so. There were no special projects written for nonpublic schools. One project was

written for each educational agency (county or city system). This project covered all eligible children irregardless of the type of school.

All summer school programs were open to all children who wished to participate. The parents of those children whom the teachers felt really needed to be in summer school were especially urged to send their children.

The programs which were most adapted to the needs of deprived children were the reading, food, health (medical and dental), and cultural enrichment programs. The use of supplies and equipment also helped.

The best example of joint planning was that with the superintendent of the Catholic schools as reported in Question 3. Dual enrollment was offered in two urban systems so students from nonpublic schools might take courses offered in public schools which were not offered in nonpublic schools.

During the regular term 5,073 children in 51 nonpublic schools participated in Title I programs. In the five institutions which participated (delinquent, retarded, blind), there were 2,974 children.

VIII. How many LEA's conducted coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs for education aides and the professional staff members they assist? What was the total number of participants in each project? Describe the general patterns of activities and provide specific examples of outstanding joint training programs.

The use of teacher and librarian aides increased in fiscal year 1970. During the regular term 1,439 teacher aides and 228 librarian aides were used. During the summer 1,129 teacher aides and 100 librarian aides were used. These totals do not include nurses' aides.

All of those systems using aides held special workshops for the aides and the teachers with whom the aides would work. All systems using aides required the aides to attend in-service sessions during the year and all special workshops. The in-service sessions included special programs dealing with such topics as early childhood education, new school developments, curriculum planning, educational development classes, etc. There were also departmentalized sessions in which teachers and aides worked together (physical education teachers and the aides who would work with them, librarians and aides who would work with them, etc.). EPDA B-2 conducted training sessions in 5 areas for 137 teacher aides. The Title I coordinator and superintendents held meetings with principals regarding the duties and use of aides in schools. The proper use of the aides was checked carefully by the consultants making administrative reviews of the Title I programs. A form for reporting workshops and in-service programs was included in the evaluation guide which reminded the LEA's of the Title I amendment concerning the training of aides. Copies of workshop schedules were enclosed with the special reports on teacher-aide programs.

IX. Describe the nature and extent of community and parent involvement in Title I programs in your State. Include outstanding examples of parent and the community involvement in Title I projects.

The responsibility of placing parents of deprived children on LEA advisory and planning committees was placed on the LEA's by the requirement from the U. S. Office of Education. The SEA insisted that this be done, and also urged the LEA's to write into the project application plans for involving the parents and community in school activities. Although there were some doubts on the part of the LEAs about the advisability of involving uneducated parents and of having success in getting the parent involved, a very good

beginning was made in FY 69. In FY 70 the involvement grew. At State area meetings the LEA's were encouraged to exchange ideas of successful involvement and of the attempts which failed. This was considered very helpful. Reports of involvement are included. A contact person is named on each report.

In some LEA's parents were lead by "out-siders" to create disturbances, make unreasonable demands, etc. The school routine in some LEA's was also interrupted by Civil Rights field workers and their demands. These incidents have tended to off-set gains made in parental involvement in those LEA's.

TITLE I, ESEA
FY 1970

	FY 70 Funds:	FY 69 Funds:
Local Agencies	$39,105,010	$34,029,865
Institutions for Handicapped	382,188	332,625
Institutions for Delinquent	226,618	201,852
Migrant Education	464,392	422,481
State Administration	401,842	349,908
TOTAL	$40,580,050	$35,335,731

FY 70 - $5,244,319 Increase over FY 1969

FY 70 - Staff:	Regular Term	Summer Term
Kindergarten teacher	23	713
Elementary teacher	1,292	3,987
Secondary teacher	626	1,347
Teacher for Handicapped	97	57
Teacher aide	1,439	1,129
Librarian	220	216
Librarian aide	228	100
Attendance worker	34	11
Administrative & Supervisory Staff	308	375
Counselor	206	87
Social worker	6	5
Psychologist	5	1
Nurse	66	42
Dental personnel	24	15
Testing staff	17	18
Clerical staff	331	281
Other staff	312	1,177

FY 70 - Construction	$395,276
FY 70 - Equipment	
Instructional	$972,018
Other Equipment	115,217

TITLE I, ESEA
FY 1970

ACTIVITIES		Regular Term		Summer Term		
Name	Number of LEAs	Number of children	Amt. Allocated	Number of children	Amt. Allocated	Total amount Allocated
Art	30	181,643	$ 859,296	33,933	$191,917	$1,051,213
Business Ed.	26	13,167	143,364	1,031	26,698	170,062
Cultural Enrichment	51	122,241	457,293	30,395	202,145	659,438
Reading	118	345,323	7,439,013	93,047	2,339,356	9,778,369
Speech	18	13,247	150,252	13,993	160,498	310,750
Language Arts	38	166,998	1,013,373	35,207	411,856	1,425,229
Foreign Language	17	7,790	105,940	365	2,006	107,946
Home Ec.	17	10,773	97,379	1,250	20,785	118,164
Industrial Arts	12	2,735	66,654	1,173	19,955	86,609
Math	85	151,921	788,957	55,704	737,845	1,526,802
Music	75	236,861	1,401,045	29,910	164,184	1,565,229
Physical Education	86	239,131	1,902,638	55,886	449,515	2,352,153
Science	59	126,092	492,588	32,569	320,120	812,708
Social Science	60	145,284	423,047	28,402	312,705	735,752
Other Voc. Ed	9	2,044	29,504	245	2,360	31,864
Spec. Activities for Handicapped	38	2,692	582,078	1,452	47,396	629,474
Other Activities	33	117,520	797,132	5,089	32,315	829,447
Kindergarten	66	1,046	178,932	12,444	640,300	819,232
SERVICES						
Attendance	30	155,276	229,623	7,218	13,306	242,929
Clothing	3	840	6,300	-	-	6,300
Food	70	73,512	968,079	50,053	283,586	1,251,665
Guidance	71	236,321	1,637,617	29,916	82,479	1,720,096
Health-Dental	35	72,239	178,511	12,440	19,541	198,052
Health-Medical	58	185,414	453,632	28,426	51,287	504,919
Library	87	279,959	1,681,884	59,550	252,416	1,934,300
Psychological	17	33,650	101,320	2,118	2,550	103,870
Social Work	7	9,087	29,534	2,495	5,780	35,314
Speech Therapy	15	2,548	106,860	3,136	15,462	122,322
Transportation	62	43,809	109,195	51,585	595,069	704,264
Spec. Serv. for Handicapped	5	283	11,065	60	9,200	20,265
Other services	34	101,519	325,019	12,834	38,445	363,464

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California 19 57 Edition 19 63 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							0-25 %ile	26-50 %ile	51-75 %ile	76-99 %ile
Pre	1	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	1050	1.13	612	210	104	124
Post	1		Spring 1970	X	5171	1.49	2121	1114	800	1136
Pre	2	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	7250	1.79	3115	1907	1369	859
Post	2		Spring 1970	X	7782	2.41	2849	1885	1600	1448
Pre	3	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	7583	2.57	2921	1869	1484	1309
Post	3		Spring '70	X	9323	3.25	3527	2092	1559	2145
Pre	4	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	16,249	3.57	6285	4737	2729	2498
Post	4		Spring 1970	X	10,379	4.25	3840	2801	1690	2048
Pre	5	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	10,085	4.26	4189	2250	1843	1803
Post	5		Spring 1970	X	11,129	4.94	4776	2824	1721	1808
Pre	6	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	16,613	4.95	7674	4009	2634	2296
Post	6		Spring 1970	X	10,363	5.48	4343	2639	1773	1608

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: Calfornia 1957 Edition 1963 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students 0-25 %ile	26-50 %ile	51-75 %ile	76-99 %ile
Pre	7	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	7823	5.65	3687	1991	1175	970
Post	7		Spring '70	X	5181	6.50	2153	1379	949	700
* Pre	8	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	4752	6.83	1842	1187	891	832
Post	8		Spring '70	X	4489	7.47	1674	1099	875	841
Pre	9	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	4327	6.99	1981	1076	750	520
Post	9		Spring '70	X	3334	8.29	1308	856	648	522
Pre	10	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	5461	8.64	2423	1389	949	700
Post	10		Spring '70	X	3325	9.34	1345	1011	631	338
* Pre	11	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	2562	10.07	977	659	517	409
Post	11		Spring '70	X	2418	10.51	895	647	480	396
Pre	12	Total Reading	Fall 1969	W	1026	9.66	465	294	189	78
Post	12		Spring '70	X	732	10.29	320	227	145	40

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____

* **Statewide testing program for grades 8 and 11 considered only if follow-up post test administered.**

GRADE	PRE TEST			POST TEST		
1	R-397	U-394	M-259	R-2719	U-1353	M-1099
LEA	R-2	U-4	M-1	R-9	U-6	M-7
2	R-5551	U-639	M-1060	R-4260	U-1946	M-1576
LEA	R-16	U-8	M-8	R-18	U-10	M-10
3	R-5417	U-1418	M-1418	R-5850	U-1614	M-1859
LEA	R-20	U-10	M-10	R-24	U-11	M-12
4	R-8292	U-550	M-7407	R-5727	U-1721	M-2931
LEA	R-25	U-10	M-15	R-22	U-13	M-16
5	R-6801	U-367	M-2917	R-6859	U-1641	M-2629
LEA	R-24	U-8	M-14	R-28	U-10	M-13
6	R-9130	U-579	M-6904	R-6116	U-1571	M-2676
LEA	R-29	U-10	M-12	R-25	U-12	M-13
7	R-4111	U-1412	M-2300	R-2596	U-777	M-1808
LEA	R-23	U-8	M-7	R-17	U-7	M-7
8	R-2327	U-1138	M-1287	R-2142	U-1095	M-1252
LEA	R-12	U-7	M-6	R-12	U-7	M-6
9	R-2281	U-751	M-1295	R-1619	U-907	M-808
LEA	R-12	U-5	M-7	R-9	U-4	M-7
10	R-2372	U-990	M-2099	R-1949	U-421	M-955
LEA	R-10	U-3	M-8	R-10	U-2	M-5

GRADE	PRE TEST			POST TEST (con't)		
11	R-1488	U-318	M-756	R-1265	U-316	M-837
LEA	R-7	U-2	M-5	R-7	U-2	M-5
12	R-454	U-12	M-560	R-430	U-12	M-290
LEA	R-3	U-1	M-5	R-3	U-1	M-3